

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claim 1 have been amended.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by Examiners Singh and Williams to Applicants' representative during the August 31, 2004 personal interview. The personal interview is summarized below and thus constitutes Applicants' record of the interview.

The specification was objected to based on various informalities. By this Amendment, the specification has been amended based on the Examiner's helpful comments. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

The Preliminary Amendment was objected to because the Preliminary Amendment improperly referred to page 15 and not page 16. As discussed during the personal interview, only page 16 was amended to reflect the amendments. It is respectfully requested that the amendments be entered.

Claims 1, 2, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Stefik et al. (Stefik), U. S. Patent No. 6,233,684. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the personal interview, Stefik fails to disclose a document forgery protection method that determines a forgery protection level to be applied to the document based on a policy that determines the forgery protection level for the document, as recited in claim 1, or a system with at least one server having a print management system and a policy that determines a forgery protection level for the document, as recited in claim 14.

As argued during the personal interview, Stefik fails to disclose using a policy to determine a forgery protection level because only the document owner, and not the printing system, specifies the watermark information (col. 12, lines 16-35). In other words, the printing system of Stefik does not include a policy that determines a forgery protection level.

Accordingly, Stefik fails to disclose all of the features recited in claims 1 and 14 as well as the additional features recited in claims 2 and 15. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stefik in view of the Livingston, U. S. Patent No. 6,621,590, claims 4, 5, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stefik in view of Livingston and in view of Cyr et al. (Cyr), U. S. Patent No. 6,138,913 and claims 6-13 and 19-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Stefik in view of Cyr. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Livingston and Cyr fail to overcome the deficiencies of Stefik as applied to claims 1 and 14. As such, the combination of Stefik, Livingston and Cyr fails to disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1 and 14 as well as the additional features recited in the dependent claims. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-26 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte  
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/sxb

Date: September 1, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--